

Kim	Myers	Shays
King	Myrick	Skeen
Kingston	Nethercutt	Smith (MI)
Kleccka	Neumann	Smith (NJ)
Klug	Ney	Smith (TX)
Knollenberg	Norwood	Smith (WA)
Kolbe	Nussle	Solomon
LaHood	Oxley	Souder
Largent	Packard	Spence
Latham	Parker	Stearns
LaTourette	Paxon	Stockman
Lazio	Petri	Stump
Leach	Pickett	Talent
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Tanner
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Tauzin
Lightfoot	Portman	Taylor (MS)
Linder	Poshard	Taylor (NC)
Lipinski	Pryce	Tejeda
Livingston	Quillen	Thomas
LoBiondo	Quinn	Thornberry
Longley	Radanovich	Thornton
Lucas	Rahall	Tiahrt
Luther	Ramstad	Torkildsen
Manzullo	Regula	Trafigant
Martini	Roberts	Upton
McCollum	Roemer	Vucanovich
McCrery	Rogers	Waldholtz
McDade	Rohrabacher	Walker
McHale	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
McHugh	Roth	Wamp
McInnis	Roukema	Watts (OK)
McIntosh	Royce	Weldon (FL)
McKeon	Salmon	Weldon (PA)
Menendez	Sanford	Weller
Metcalf	Saxton	White
Meyers	Scarborough	Whitfield
Mica	Schaefer	Wicker
Miller (FL)	Schiff	Williams
Minge	Scott	Wolf
Molinari	Seastrand	Woolsey
Moorhead	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)
Morella	Shadegg	Zeliff
Murtha	Shaw	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra	Horn	Schumer
Blute	Kasich	Shuster
Clinger	Lantos	Tate
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Torricelli
Dornan	Moran	Towns
Flake	Payne (NJ)	Wilson
Gephardt	Riggs	Young (AK)
Hilliard	Rose	

□ 1159

Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. LUTHER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendment in the nature of substitute made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on International Relations

and the Committee on National Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed ten hours. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on National Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 872. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause (5)(a) of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instruction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

My colleagues, this is a very, very busy period of time. We are producing a great deal of legislation. We are doing it always constantly under time constraints.

Certainly, all the Members are to be appreciated for the efforts they make not only on the floor but in their committees. It is a rigorous time period.

We have an opportunity to be out of here by 3 p.m. tomorrow and have a period of time for a rest and family and district work period, where we can perhaps all get a chance to sort of refresh ourselves before we come back to work.

Let me just say, it is the resolve of the leadership that we will complete this bill before we leave here. We believe we have every opportunity to do so in such a manner that Members can make a 3 o'clock flight tomorrow afternoon and begin that rest period. We intend to make that flight period.

We are prepared, on the other hand, if it is necessary, to work through the night. And should we, even under those circumstances, fail to complete the bill by our desired 3 o'clock departure time tomorrow, we are prepared to accept

the necessity of keeping Members as late after 3 o'clock tomorrow as is necessary.

The bottom line is that our resolve to pass this bill before we depart town is so great that we will do whatever it takes to do so.

Now, we believe that it should be quite comfortably done by a fairly early rise this evening and a 3 o'clock departure tomorrow, if everything goes smoothly. And that is what we hope and expect. But the Members should be prepared to check their travel arrangements for the unlikely possibility that they may not make their planes tomorrow.

In any event, we will complete this bill. The bottom line point is very clear, and we must not be mistaken. We will complete this bill before we depart town.

I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 83 is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act of 1995. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on National Security.

The rule provides for 10 full hours of debate on the amendment process. It makes in order the text of H.R. 872, which is considered as read, as the original bill for amendment purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule accords priority recognition to Members who have had their amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but does not prevent other amendments which were not printed from being considered.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions, a right we guarantee to the minority in our new rules, even though we never received the same guarantees from the Democrats when they were in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, I made a good-faith effort, as did the majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, for 3 days running to reach accommodation with our minority colleagues on the amount of time that would be made available for consideration of amendments. We were willing to extend consideration of amendments by several hours, if we were then to be given unanimous consent to come in earlier on Wednesday, that is today, and on Thursday, tomorrow. That offer was not accepted by the Democrat leadership.

I regret that the good intentions of Members on both sides of the aisle did not prove sufficient to overcome the obstacles put up by some other Members. Accordingly, there are 10 hours allocated for the amendment process. That is too bad, because we could have had 14, 15, 16 hours in that process.

There will be other opportunities this session, particularly when the defense authorization bill comes to the floor this summer, to continue the important debate that is starting today with consideration of this bill. This bill is narrowly focused on just a few issues.

Turning now, Mr. Speaker, to the substance of the legislation itself, I would like to begin by reading these words and Members might listen over there by reading words by a great American President. And he was a great American President.

He said, "We, in this country, in this generation, are by destiny rather than choice the watchmen on the walls of world freedom."

□ 1210

He went on to say, this President: "Words alone are not enough. The United States is a peaceful nation. And where our strength and determination are clear, our words need merely to convey conviction, not belligerence. If we are strong, our strength will speak for itself. If we are weak, our words will be of no help."

Mr. Speaker, the words I have just read are as true today as they were a generation ago, when President John F. Kennedy, a man I admire, intended to say them on what turned out to be a fateful day of tragedy in Dallas. He never had the opportunity. That was too bad. It was sad.

Mr. Speaker, the National Security Revitalization Act is the first step toward the recovery of a military posture that will permit our country to defend its vital interests around this world without qualification or reservation, no matter what.

Our country did not seek this responsibility, as President Kennedy noted. The obligation to lead the free world was thrust upon us 50 years ago in 1945, and it continues today. It is our obligation to America and the free world. We have been faithful to that call, and the perimeter of freedom has been expanded to include many more countries today than it did 50 years ago in the ruins of Europe and East Asia. All of this came at a cost, Mr. Speaker, but it has come at a cost which has declined in relative terms. We need to remember that.

Even at the height of President Reagan's military buildup in the 1980's, defense spending consumed a substantially smaller portion of this Federal budget and the gross national product than it did during the 1950's, the last time we had balanced budgets, by the way; that is a shame. That should tell us something about where the deficits have been coming from. They have not been coming because of a defense buildup, they have come because of increased, irresponsible discretionary spending by this body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take note, before I conclude my remarks, that there are several portions of the National Security Revitalization Act that are of particular concern to me. I

strongly support all of the requirements and the conditions in the bill concerning the participation of U.S. forces in the U.N. peacekeeping missions.

Next week this House will have to consider a supplemental appropriation bill to restore adequate funding to the military readiness accounts that have become so depleted by the indiscriminate involvement of U.S. forces in so-called peacekeeping missions.

I also strongly support the withholding of certain U.S. funds to the regular budget of the United Nations, pending the implementation of reforms in that body, including the appointment of an independent inspector general. Ten years ago President Reagan appointed me and our former colleague on the other side of the aisle, Dan Mica, as delegates to the U.N. General Assembly. The two of us fought tenaciously to bring about administrative and budgetary reforms in the United Nations. We succeeded on some fronts, and we did not succeed on others.

However, everything we did accomplish was made possible by the willingness of this Congress to pass my amendments to withhold portions of the U.S. assessment until the United Nations got the message, and they did get the message. They did put through reforms, thanks to Dan Mica and myself, who pursued it on the floor of the General Assembly.

In this bill, we have taken the same approach again. It is the only thing that works. It is the only thing that makes those bureaucrats at the United Nations listen. This time, I hope we will get a truly independent inspector general appointed once and for all. It is absurd that an organization of that size, spending U.S. taxpayer dollars, has taken so long to get an inspector general to oversee them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I wish the portions of this legislation dealing with the expansion of NATO would go a little farther than they do. Having served as a permanent representative to the political arm of NATO, the North Atlantic Assembly, for the past 15 years, I strongly support the admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia to full membership in NATO. I would like to see a date certain for the admission of these four nations. But I am pleased that this bill, thanks to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, does make a statutory commitment to the expansion of NATO and for the eventual admission of these nations. In the not-too-distant future, I hope NATO will consider taking in the three Baltic nations, as well as other nations formerly enslaved by the old Soviet Union.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule, and I urge support for the bill that will be coming up later today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 83, the rule limiting debate on the National Security Revitalization Act. As my colleague on the other side of the aisle well knows, the bill before us today is the most far-reaching foreign policy legislation to come before the House of Representatives in several years. In addition to radically altering the way we conduct foreign policy, the bill requires the development of a national missile defense system, like star wars, at the earliest practical date. These changes, which are enormous in magnitude, costing taxpayers up to \$30 billion, are being rushed to the floor under a rule which allows only 10 hours of debate for amendments.

This time cap, Mr. Speaker, is particularly disappointing when we consider the scope and breadth of this bill. The last major defense bill took 31 hours on the floor of the House. The Desert Storm legislation alone—a single peacekeeping effort—took 30 hours. All our constituents deserve more from this Congress than ramming bills through to meet an arbitrary Contract-With-America deadline. The changes outlined in this bill will have an effect on every single one of our constituents' pocketbooks. It could also affect those Americans with children who could be sent overseas to fight wars. We should slow down the process on this bill and allow major amendments on the many area of concern.

I understand my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to have this bill finished by Thursday afternoon. There is no reason on Earth why we could not have this bill carry over until next week and finish it on Tuesday. Our leadership was involved in negotiations which asked for an additional 12-13 hours. That is a single extra day. Unfortunately this request was denied.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe our Members are aware of the shortcomings of this piece of legislation. As Secretary of State Warren Christopher testified before the International Relations Committee, had this bill been law in 1990, President Bush would not have been able to deploy troops and ships to Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm. This bill would have blocked President Clinton from deploying 30,000 troops to Kuwait in 1994. It would have even blocked President Truman from deploying troops to Korea in 1950.

I am particularly concerned with title IV and title V of the bill which have to do with U.S. participation in peacekeeping activities. These provisions could have the effect of eliminating U.S. funding for peacekeeping missions. We should be trying to improve

the U.N. activities, not eliminate a collective security tool and undermine the President's authority as Commander in Chief. As former Secretary of State James Baker said before the International Relations Committee, "Attempts at congressional micromanagement were a bad idea when the Democrats were in control. And they remain a bad idea today."

Amendments to all the titles in this bill also deserve ample time for debate. Title II raises fundamental questions about whether we choose star wars over readiness for our national defense strategy. Title III creates a commission which undermines the duties of the Secretary of Defense. Title VI adds new countries to NATO which the United States could be obliged to defend. Who are these countries? What is their background? What is their leadership? We need time to debate this and understand what we are doing here.

Mr. Speaker, these are not small issues. There are a myriad of unanswered questions on the provisions of this bill. This rules does allow us enough time to answer these questions and to sensibly deal with the complicated issues of national security that are radically changed under this bill.

Therefore I oppose this rule and urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this restrictive rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Miami, FL, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, a very distinguished new member of this Committee on Rules.

□ 1220

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I had a professor in school who would tell us that when you are going to argue a case in court, if you can, first argue the law. If you cannot argue the law, then argue the facts, if you can. And if you cannot do that either, then argue lack of fairness.

And I remember that, because today my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle are arguing, and I think will be arguing, not so much the law or the facts, but we have already begun to hear them argue lack of fairness, lack of equity, and quite frankly, I would submit that that argument is unfair, that the argument that we are not being fair today is unfair when we analyze the facts with regard to this proposed law.

We are calling for in this rule, Mr. Speaker, not only 1 hour, for 1 hour of debate on this rule, which will guide the debate with regard to the remainder of this process, but we are calling for 2 additional hours of general debate on the proposal, and an additional 10 hours for the amendment process. That is for a total today on this one bill of 13 hours, 13 hours in addition to the fact that we had almost 1 hour already of debate on this supposed lack of fairness when we debated just a few days ago on a motion made by the majority leader to permit committees in this

House to sit while the House is meeting today on this particular rule.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. I would be happy to debate the gentleman.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Let me write them down. Your questions tend to be long.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is going to run out of time. The gentleman should use his own time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would be happy to debate you on both substance and process.

The gentleman was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the previous 2 years. Can the gentleman cite an instance where during the debate on a major issue there was a motion to cut off debate and move with a vote in the 2 years the gentleman spent on the Committee on Foreign Affairs? We gave every member an opportunity to fully debate the issue, unlike when this bill was before the committees, where motion after motion was made to cut off debate.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Reclaiming my time, I have here a list that the chairman of the Committee on Rules will expand upon of numerous instances where on national security matters your party, sir, limited debate extraordinarily. If I may, sir, if I may, I yielded, and now I have the opportunity to reply, where your party limited debate in an extraordinary fashion, cutting off time, time and time again, on issues such as the strategic defense initiative and Somalia and Haiti and Bosnia, and with regard to this debate today, we have 13 hours.

Let the debate begin.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must say as this body rushes this bill through to get out for the Presidents' Day recess, my guess is every prior President will be horrified and ask us to cancel the recess, because this bill goes to the very core, the very core of what this Government is about and our very national security.

I never, never recall a closed rule on any issue of national security or the gulf war or any of those issues. The most precious thing we have are our young people, and how we protect them, how we deploy them, and what we do with the world leadership that has been cast upon us is very critical, and to get out of here real fast and cut this off, I think, is really very tragic.

This bill, when it first appeared in our committee, many of us started screaming, "Author, author," because we could not believe it. We have not found out who the author is. We are beginning to think it was an intern project for the Heritage Foundation or something. They did change it in many

ways, because in the two little mini hearings we had, we pointed out all sorts of things that were wrong.

And there are still many things wrong that make this bill rotten to the core. No. 1, do we want to politicize the Pentagon? Do we want to run the committee by a committee? Do you want a committee of political appointees that are not elected running the Pentagon? Well, if you do, vote "yes" on the bill.

Do you want to absolutely end burden-sharing forever and ever? If you do, do this. This is saying we will be the 911 number, we will do whatever it takes.

Do you want to deploy SDI even though no one thinks we should do this crash deployment? It will cost megabucks, gigabucks. Where are you going to get this money? That will only pull more money from readiness that everybody is talking about in the hollow force. If you do, you should vote for this bill.

Do you want to dictate to the United Nations and to NATO as to who they let in, how they run it, like it is our party, and no one else has a role in this new world order? I do not think so.

Do you want to tie the hands of future commanders like Schwarzkopf so they cannot do anything even in a fox-hole without calling back to four congressional committees or the President or the committee running the Pentagon or whatever?

I think these are serious issues. America has never dealt with its national security in this way. This is a radical, radical revolution.

Let us be perfectly clear what we are doing here today. I think we ought to slow down and go with the deliberate debate that we had in the committee, that caused them to change many, many of the first areas, and because they did not like what they were hearing, they shut that off, and now they are trying to shut us off on the floor so they can hurry up and punch another hole in a piece of paper.

I think it is wrong. I think we should vote "no" on this rule, and I think America deserves much better.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I say to the gentlewoman that I wish she had been around to get us some time when we debated Somalia, when the House had only 1 hour of general debate and only six amendments allowed. When we sent troops into Haiti, we were allowed a closed rule providing for 2 hours of general debate with only two amendments made in order. The list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], my good friend, a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just say to my friend from Colorado, yes, a number of former Presidents would be appalled at what has happened this year, because we have cut defense to the lowest level

in terms of percentage of gross national product since Pearl Harbor. That would have upset John Kennedy, that would have upset Harry Truman, and the fact that 17,000 young military families are on food stamps today would have certainly upset those gentlemen and Dwight Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan, and the fact that we have cut \$127 billion below the budget that former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell, Dick Cheney, and former President Bush said was prudent is also a cause for concern.

Let me just say this administration is in disarray in defense. Our own GAO says that the President has underfunded his own plan by \$150 billion. There is a sense of urgency, and if we are going to respond to that sense of urgency, we need to put this bill up. We need to debate it. We need to pass it.

We need to protect our troops.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], another distinguished member of the Committee on National Security and another California. Boy, they are all over the place.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentlewoman says no one wants to do this. In our committee, she is well aware, it was 43 to 13. It was a bipartisan bill that came out of the committee. Those that are upset are those that have tried to defund defense for the great failed society programs, including the gentlewoman from California.

Take a look at the speakers that are opposed to this; they are the same ones that have attempted to dismantle national security.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], one of the most distinguished Members of this House, the new chairman of the Committee on International Relations who has brought this bill on the floor.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in support of the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 7. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for his cooperation in providing a fair rule so that we can bring this bill to the floor. And I thank my colleagues in our committees and in the House leadership for their assistance, and participation in brining this important measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. It does not limit the consideration of amendments to this bill in terms of what amendments can be offered, when they can be offered, or by whom they can be offered. The issue before us is a matter of degree: How long will the Committee of the Whole be required to sit? I submit that the balance struck in this bill of 10 hours is reasonable.

For our part, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the aisle, we will attempt to limit the time our side takes up in debate. We want to give those who seek

to amend the bill the maximum time possible to present their arguments. And if Members want to explore with me, and with Chairman SPENCE, the possibility of our accepting amendments with minimal debate, amendments that can be cleared on both sides, we will certainly be amendable to proceeding in that manner.

The provisions of H.R. 7 have been subject to wide attention, including NATO expansion, restricting command of U.S. Forces, and limiting funding of U.N. peacekeeping.

Before we began our markup, our International Relations Committee held several days of hearings during which witnesses were invited to address the bill.

Our committee considered this bill at length during a 3-day markup.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to address the substance of this bill.

First, it is meant to strengthen American security and to protect its financial interests with respect to U.N. peacekeeping activities. Allegations that this bill undermines U.N. peacekeeping are simply unfounded.

All that this bill does is to establish a truth in budgeting standard. Essentially, if Congress has enacted a law, and the President has signed that law, and that law says "we are going to spend some amount on U.N. peacekeeping then we would not permit any administration to circumvent that decision by providing the United Nations with unlimited in kind services. It is just that fundamental.

Second, this bill limits the subordination of American Armed Forces to the command or operational control of foreign nationals acting on behalf of the United Nations in peacekeeping operations.

Finally, we provide for the adaption of NATO to the modern age by providing a dynamic process for its expansion eastward.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable rule and a good bill.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

□ 1230

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I support my colleagues on the Democratic side in their efforts here, but not because I am sure that 12 hours is not enough. All of that is relative. It just seems to me there is a larger issue at stake in the Democrats' effort here; that is, to be sure that the Republican effort to market their accomplishments in November 1996 does not drive policy considerations here. And it seems to me that their political marketing is driving their necessity of passing a certain number of bills in 100 days and that that is what they are about. And that is not the way United States gets good policy.

But is 12 hours enough? Well, I do not know. It is relative. Time here is relative. Twelve hours compared to what?

After all, the Constitution says we will promote the national defense, but also it says something about promoting the general welfare of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I have done a little research. Let me share these bills with my colleagues: Starting back in 1991, the Drop-Out Prevention Act, the National Literacy Act. In 1992, the Children Nutrition Improvements Act; Abandoned Infants Act; Head Start. In 1993, the disability amendments; the School-to-Work Opportunity Act. In 1994, the Nutrition and Health for Children's Act, and the critical Safe Schools Act.

All of those combined did not take up 9 hours of debate from 1991 until today on this House floor. My point, my colleagues, is this: I believe that national defense is absolutely critical and should have the attention of this Congress.

But after 17 years here, I have learned something: The Congress of the United States has more than an interest in national defense, we have a fetish with the Pentagon. And it is diverting our attention from other essential matters such as those I have raised.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today I come to the well of this Chamber in strong opposition of to H.R. 7, the National Security Act. In pursuit of catchy campaign promises, the Republicans will risk our national security by forcing us to spend billions of dollars on an unproven and unnecessary star wars—and all in a mere 10 hours of debate.

Every day in Washington we confront a budgetary climate that demands fiscal restraint. Nevertheless, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle propose to spend billions of dollars to revive a corpse of the cold war that was better left in its grave. They would place a higher priority on building a budget-busting fantasy in the sky than on funding school lunches for our children, and home delivered meals for our elderly.

Mr. Speaker, today the choice is clear: pork in the sky, or food on kids' plates down here on Earth. Let us do the right thing. Let us let a bad idea rest in peace.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a very valuable member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS].

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Rules for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have not forgotten the last time we allowed our

Armed Forces to go unfunded or our foreign policy to become muddled.

Terms from the Carter years, like hollow force and foreign policy quagmire, are terms that we still see and still strike a chord with us and, unfortunately, they are resurfacing in our national dialog.

H.R. 7 attempts to address some of the immediate concerns Americans have about our national security and foreign policy. It does not solve all of the problems, but it starts.

I am pleased that the Committee on Rules gave us a rule for consideration of this bill that allows for 2 hours of general debate and 10 hours of an open amendment process, 10 hours.

Make no mistake, this rule allows for the consideration of any germane amendment by any Member. Unlike consideration of national security in previous years, the Committee on Rules has not excluded specific amendments nor have we singled out certain amendments for special status, placing them above others. Yes, there is an option to prefile, and, yes, there is an overall time limit to help us move reasonably expeditiously on this legislation.

But I am confident that we can have a well-managed and disciplined debate—and the word here is disciplined—that covers all the major issues in the time allotted. H.R. 7 does raise some substantive issues, issues on which it is clear Members have legitimate philosophical differences and deserve debate. One area that I happen to take a strong interest in is Haiti. Right now, upstairs in the Rules Committee, we are determining ways to pay the bills that are now coming due for that misadventure and a result of what I would call muddled foreign policy, characterized by flipflops, suffering, a brutal embargo on a friendly country, an armed invasion in a friendly country, and costing millions and millions and millions of dollars, that we are going to see as we get into the emergency supplemental bill from Department of Defense, and look at that and some other issues.

The lack of coordination, the lack of consistency, and the lack of clarity in foreign policy has a price, and unfortunately we are going to have to pay it. H.R. 7 addresses some of that, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule. I think it is the right rule for the process, and I support H.R. 7.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, again this legislation is bad in substance and in process. In committee, oftentimes with barely a few minutes of debate on an issue, motions were made to cut off debate and vote the issue, and virtually always on a party line.

But, in substance, this legislation is worse than it is in process. And I hope in my heart that some of the Members

on the other side will take the time to read what this legislation does.

There is a question of whether or not our troops can remain as they are today in Korea. They are not under an American command. The gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Committee on International Relations, could explain to me—and I would be happy to yield to him—how it is we retain our activities in Korea under this legislation?

□ 1240

There is a special exemption for Macedonia. There is no exemption for Korea. It is not a unilateral American action where they are under the United Nations. How does the President operate there?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] for yielding. All we are saying, that our divisions, our troops, our personnel will be under direct U.S. command—

Mr. GEJDENSON. Reclaiming my time—

Mr. GILMAN. I am trying to respond to the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Reclaiming my time, our troops in Korea are not under American command at the moment.

Mr. GILMAN. I am saying that our troops, under American command, can work in coordination with any commander in that theater.

Mr. GEJDENSON. It is not what the—reclaiming my time, that is not what the legislation says. What the legislation says is that almost every stage, from the top of the military operation to the bottom there, has to be American commanders. That is not occurring in the Korean theater at the moment, and under this legislation it leaves in real question whether we can continue to operate in Korea.

Mr. GILMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I say to the gentleman, "I will not yield, and, if you look at what we do here, we take the President—you take the President of the United States, and you give him one option, and that option is unilateral action with American forces, without any support from any of our allies."

That means every crisis around the globe is an American crisis, and like when the Congress prevented the President from joining the League of Nations at the end of World War II, we will sow the seeds of additional disharmony in the world.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a very valuable member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is mistaken. I was in charge with fleet core group of all the troops in Korea. There is a four-star Air Force General that is in charge with a brick over all forces, and any Navy force that goes into that gulf is in charge under that four-star except for the direction of the carrier. They are not under U.N. control. The U.S. military is in control, and what we are trying to do is take the control of Boutros Boutros-Ghali and the rest of it away from our troops.

I say to the gentleman, "I was there for 4 years and conducted it, GEJDENSON. Don't you tell me who has control."

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], for clarifying that point.

This is a good rule, and I compliment the Committee on Rules for this fair and honest rule. I know that they deliberated long and diligently on this rule, and I applaud them. I appeared before the Committee on Rules, and, while this is not the rule that I would have drafted, it is a fair and prudent rule.

What this rule does provide for basically is two things. Amendments printed in the RECORD will get preferential consideration; that is only fair; and it provides for a definite time period to complete debate; again only fair. I myself asked for a section-by-section consideration, but the majority, and they are Republicans on the Committee on Rules, thought otherwise is to be more fair to our friends on the other side of the aisle. They felt that, if we would have had a section-by-section debate of the bill, it would have more of a logical progression to the debate, but I know our side of the aisle wanted to be fair to the other side, and so also I say this is a fair rule.

Every Member in this Congress at one point or another has been discussing and debating the issues in this bill for years, some for decades. In our committee hearing we had countless hours of amendments in debate, 21 amendments. Twenty-one amendments were offered and debated and considered in our committee.

In the Contract With America we pledged that in the first 100 days we would vote on 10 specific major issues. Strengthening our national defense is one of these issues; more specifically, on how we interact with the United Nations and the amount of dollars that we, the American taxpayer, put into the U.N. fund, peacekeeping, and other U.N. activities.

I have a premonition that some in this body would consciously or subconsciously use this rule as a way, as a pretext, to attack the Contract With America, to divert attention from the Contract With America, but we have made a commitment with the American people. We have made a pact, a

covenant, and when we conservatives give our word, we aim to keep it. Where we made a covenant, it is not campaign rhetoric, it is not grist for the media. We mean it. Therefore we will debate and vote on this bill and move on to the other elements of the Contract With America, but we will do it in fairness, and we will do it judiciously.

This bill is in line with what the American people want. They voted for this Contract With America last November 8. The American people do not want American soldiers being used as pawns in the United Nations designs. They do not want American soldiers to be under other than U.S. command in peacekeeping operations. American taxpayers want and will contribute their fair share to the U.N. operations. But American taxpayers no longer want to be milked by the United Nations.

The United Nations all too often looks at America as a dairy cow to be milked. Well, we conservatives will do our fair share, but we will not allow America to be milked as a dairy cow is milked. We will do our fair share, but we look upon America as a strong horse pulling a heavy load, and then some, but we are no one's dairy cow to be milked, and that includes the United Nations.

If this bill were coming up under the old majority, this bill would be considered under a closed rule. Most of the amendments we will be debating on and voting on in the next 13 hours. Thirteen hours would never have been allowed under the old majority. The tally that the chairman of the Committee on Rules has been keeping over the last several years proves that point. Virtually every major bill in the last few years has been up under a closed rule with limited debate. We, the Republicans, have a greater confidence in this House and the legislative process. We want a full and complete debate, 1 hour on the rule, 2 hours for general debate, 10 hours on the amendments, 13 hours of total work on this legislation, on a bill that all of us have debated.

There is not a Member in this House that does not know both sides of debate on any one of these issues to come up. We also have confidence that the bill will withstand the scrutiny of this House and the American people who voted for the Contract With America.

Yes, this is a fair bill, and I congratulate the Committee on Rules because I know they worked hard. I know they had to make some tough decisions. This is a good rule, and this is an excellent bill. The American people voted for this bill on November 8, and I ask this House to vote for this bill today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing and unfortunate that the

real vestige of the cold war thinking is right here in the U.S. Congress. Now that democracy is at the doorstep of nations formerly a part of the Communist block, this bill takes \$30 billion steps backward.

The American taxpayers want every nation to play a role in the global march toward democracy. The tragedy of this bill, however, is that it will force the United States to go it alone when the world finds itself in crisis. This bill hamstring the President and undermines his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief.

This is just another buzz bill filled with buzz words, cooked up by a Republican pollster to try and make Republicans appear to be responsible in the area of foreign policy. The Devil, however, is always in the details, and this bill is short on details and long on the Devil. If this bill passes, we cannot say, "The Devil made us do it," but "A Republican-led Congress made us do it."

Vote "no" on the rule and vote "no" on the bill.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, this bill could be dubbed the "Terminator" since it will wipe out all supranational options for the United States when peace and democracy are in danger. Just like the Terminator, if this bill passes, we, too, can say "Hasta la vista, baby." And in the process, we'll be saying so long to future contributions to operations like Cyprus, the Sinai, Haiti, and Kashmir. And in the process, this Terminator bill hamstring the President and undermines his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief.

This bill also has an unfunded mandate for NATO expansion, but sidesteps the fact that it is also committing the United States to defend every country that becomes part of the new NATO.

And let me say a word about this buzz word of foreign command and control. The forces of the United States are never under foreign command. This is just another buzz word cooked up by a Republican pollster to make them appear to be responsible in the area of foreign policy.

This bill paves the way for early NATO entry for a few, but isolates the majority of burgeoning democracies committed to the partnership for peace. Many of those left out are more viable than some of those put in. This is recklessness to say the least.

We must demand that those entering a new NATO must not only uphold our shared values upon entry, but that they continue to uphold human rights, avoid acts of armed aggression, and cease providing lethal weaponry to third parties—in order to remain part of NATO.

The Devil is always in the details. This bill is short on details, but long on the Devil. If this bill passes, we cannot say that the Devil made us do it, but we can lay this reckless piece of foreign policy legislation squarely at the doorstep of a Republican-led Congress. We ought to say "Hasta la vista, baby" to this bill.

□ 1250

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would make an inquiry of the Chair with regard to the time remaining on each side for this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 4½ minutes re-

maining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the former chairman and now ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about this rule, it is a closed rule and it keeps Members of Congress from voting on amendments. Just yesterday an identical rule shut out at least a half a dozen Democratic amendments because they just did not have time. The time ran out. There is no reason to think that this rule would be any different.

We are not talking about some inconsequential bill; we are talking about the national security of the United States. This bill limits the commander in chief's ability to direct American troops in conflict.

It redefines the U.S. relationship with our allies, it threatens the future of the United States, and it completely redirects American defense priorities.

Mr. Speaker, the issues it deals with is no small potatoes, and this should be nonpartisan. But Republicans have refused to work with Democrats. They want to hurry up and start the long weekend. They want to get on with the contract.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, it is impossible to spend too much time discussing the security of the American people. The chairman of the Committee on Rules said that Members ought to know enough about this bill to vote on it. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree with him, we do know enough about this bill. We know enough to realize that it is a rash, irresponsible, extremist mess that needs to be fixed.

But, Mr. Speaker, Members will not get the chance to amend this bill because Republicans just do not have the time. Democrats are willing to work late, to stay in town this weekend, and do whatever it takes to protect our citizens, but instead we are being forced to address this dangerous mix of isolationism and star wars and being told to hurry up or shut up.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, yield? And he is my good friend.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I will yield, absolutely, yes, as soon as I finish my statement.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to treat the defense of this country, and it is no way to govern.

I would also add that this bill revives an incredibly expensive military program that was doomed from the start. To put it simply, star wars will not work. It costs too much money. Furthermore, spending money on star wars

will take funds away from protecting our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the previous question so we can get rid of this time cap that will gag Members of Congress and do a straight, open rule on the bill. The safety of American troops is a lot more important than some pie-in-the-sky fantasy, and I think Members ought to be able to offer amendments to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to vote no on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my very good friend that he seems to infer that I personally have not been cooperative and have not been a gentleman.

Mr. MOAKLEY. No, let me just assure the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman has hurt my feelings because—

Mr. MOAKLEY. No, no. I say this because I look upon the gentleman as the leader of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will not belabor the point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has expired.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, his bill is the most far-reaching foreign policy bill to come before the House in several years, and we are debating it for 10 hours to meet a political deadline and to make the congressional recess.

This is what this bill does: It would force the United States to take on the world by itself in every instance; it would put excessive conditions and restrictions on the President's conduct of national security affairs; it would cripple U.N. peacekeeping; and it would move the United States toward new security commitments in Eastern and Central Europe at a time of declining resources.

The bill raises significant issues that go to the heart of national security. Title II raises questions about whether we choose star wars over readiness in our national defense strategy; title II creates a National Security Commission that would usurp the role of Congress and the executive branch; and titles IV and V seriously threaten U.S. national security by eliminating an important collective security tool and completely undermines the President's authority as Commander in Chief.

Let us talk about what this means in practical terms. The Democratic Caucus has tried hard to focus on the key issues of this bill. We plan to offer only eight or nine amendments. We have less than an hour per amendment, less than an hour to debate star wars versus readiness, less than an hour to debate whether the United States cuts off par-

ticipation in U.N. peacekeeping activities, and less than an hour to debate whether the United States dramatically expands its defense commitments in Eastern Europe, as called for in title VI.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of issues in this bill that deserve much more time. This bill would cripple American national security policy. It is the wrong signal to send to our NATO allies. If I were a NATO ally and I woke up tomorrow and saw that this bill had passed, I would think it was a bad dream or a joke.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. Let us not move ahead with this legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7 is the most far-reaching foreign-policy bill to come before this House in a number of years. I suspect that Members will not have an opportunity to vote on a more important foreign policy bill than this one, and I do not know of any authorization bill that will follow that will, within the confines of one bill, raise more key national security issues than this bill.

I think the bill does not revitalize our national security; indeed, I think it weakens it. I think the bill overall strikes at the heart of the President's authority and ability and capability to protect the national security and to conduct foreign policy. It ends U.N. peacekeeping, despite the statements that have been made to the contrary. That is the opinion of the Defense Department, it is the opinion of the State Department, and it is the opinion of the Deputy Under Secretary under President Reagan, who said that this bill would hinder and bankrupt U.N. peacekeeping.

I think there is no doubt about the importance of the bill on U.N. peacekeeping. U.N. peacekeeping has been used by every President in recent times to promote American national interests. I think the bill prematurely and unilaterally, designates certain countries for NATO membership, picking winners and losers in a way that could actually slow down the process of NATO expansion.

□ 1300

H.R. 7 micromanages American foreign policy. It undercuts the President's authority. It limits the President's authority to respond to crises and to our national security interests.

Now, all of that is simply to suggest that this is a very, very important bill. Each title raises significant national security concerns, and we are doing it with extremely limited debate, on the

most momentous national security issues that we will debate in this Congress.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to speak out of order).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 129 last night I meant to vote "no" and I left the voting station believing I have voted "no." I learned a few minutes ago the voting machine recorded a "yes" vote for me, which was obviously a mistake. I ask that the RECORD show that on rollcall 129 I intended my vote to be a "no" vote, not "aye."

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I come before you mainly on the proposition of peacekeeping. I have been intimately involved in Africa the last 2 years. If this bill is passed, you would not have any such thing as Rwanda, where we went in under the U.N. umbrella immediately and solved the cholera situation. We put 4,000 troops in there and saved probably 200,000 Rwandans and pulled them out without one casualty of American troops there.

You are now tying the hands of the President of the United States. You are setting a precedent here that is unprecedented in the history of the United States, requiring the Chief Executive Officer to come to Congress before they can put in a peacekeeping group.

Let me propose to the Republicans the hypothetical proposed by JIM LEACH, Congressman JIM LEACH, a republican from Iowa, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Let us assume in August of this year there is a peace agreement between Syria and Israel, and the Syrians and the Israelis ask the United States to put in 100 troops into the Golan Heights to protect each side. We are on leave at that time. The President literally could not move if this bill becomes law.

I think it is irresponsible for us to consider this and go forward with what we are doing to the United States, what we are doing to the United Nations, and what we are doing to peacekeeping in the world.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from the other side of the aisle and from Youngstown, OH, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. I support the rule and support the bill. The bill makes sense. The American people are fed up. They are fed up with the United Nations that dials 911, and they are fed up with a Congress that not only pays for the 911 call, but then sends an American Express card to pay for all this business.

I think, Congress, it is about time we start facing the facts. The American

people are tired of hearing all the debate about Russia. They want to learn what happened about Rhode Island. They are sick and tired about all of this talk about Mexico and saving Mexico. They are concerned about Mississippi and Massachusetts. We are not listening. I think it is time to take a look at that, ladies and gentleman, and we are not.

All this bill is totally acceptable for me. I am going to vote for it. I have some concerns about star wars, but I have an amendment. We cap our participation and cost contribution to peacekeeping to 25 percent in this bill. The Traficant amendment would reduce it to 20 percent, but would allow the President for need to expand that increase to 25 percent. But the President must notify the Congress of such increase and, second of all, justify the reasons for it.

I think it is time we get some bureaucracy in some dark room of the Capitol with a calculator that keeps track on what we are spending, and that is exactly what my amendment will do.

By the way, I think it is time we start worrying about the people in America. Instead of worrying about patrolling and controlling other countries' borders, I think it is time we start looking at our own borders in our own country and start using our resources to invest in America.

That is only my position. I think it is a good commonsense bill. I am going to support it. And I think we should look at it on the merit. There are amendments that when you disagree with something, you could voice your will.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about what the Republicans are trying to do here today. In about the same time it would take to watch the movie "Dumb and Dumber" five times, the Republicans are asking us to totally redefine America's national security interests. In the past 5 weeks alone, this House has spent 14 hours debating the rules of the House, 2 days debating the line-item veto, 2 weeks debating the unfunded mandates bill, and yet in less than 1 day's time the Republicans are asking us to totally rewrite American foreign policy, restructure the Nation's defense policy, and spend tens of billions of dollars more on star wars.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, this has got to be extremism's finest hour.

Last year we spent over 2 weeks debating the defense appropriations bill, over 200 amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules and over 100 amendments were made in order on the House floor. Yet today we are going to be allowed to offer just a handful of amendments to a bill that redefines America's national interests.

The Republicans are in such a hurry to punch another hole in their contract

that they are willing to blindly rush through a bill that will punch a gaping hole into our national defense. I urge my colleagues, say no to extremism, say no to this rule, and say no to star wars.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Abercrombie	Coyne	Greenwood	Longley	Pastor	Solomon
Ackerman	Cramer	Gundersen	Lowey	Paxon	Souder
Allard	Crane	Gutierrez	Lucas	Payne (NJ)	Spence
Andrews	Crapo	Gutknecht	Luther	Payne (VA)	Spratt
Armey	Creameans	Hall (OH)	Maloney	Pelosi	Stearns
Bachus	Cubin	Hall (TX)	Manton	Peterson (FL)	Stenholm
Baesler	Cunningham	Hamilton	Manzullo	Peterson (MN)	Stockman
Baker (CA)	Danner	Hancock	Markey	Petri	Stokes
Baker (LA)	Davis	Hansen	Martinez	Pickett	Studds
Baldacci	de la Garza	Harman	Martini	Pombo	Stump
Ballenger	Deal	Hastert	Mascara	Pomeroy	Stupak
Barcia	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)	Matsui	Porter	Talent
Barr	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy	Portman	Tanner
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Hayes	McCollum	Poshard	Tate
Barrett (WI)	Dellums	Hayworth	McCrery	Pryce	Tauzin
Bartlett	Deutsch	Hefley	McDade	Quillen	Taylor (MS)
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hefner	McDermott	Quinn	Taylor (NC)
Bass	Dickey	Heineman	McHale	Radanovich	Tejeda
Bateman	Dicks	Herger	McHugh	Rahall	Thomas
Beilenson	Dingell	Hilleary	McInnis	Ramstad	Thompson
Bentsen	Dixon	Hilliard	McIntosh	Rangel	Thornberry
Bereuter	Doggett	Hinchey	McKeon	Reed	Thornton
Bevill	Dooley	Hobson	McKinney	Regula	Thurman
Bilbray	Doolittle	Hoekstra	McNulty	Reynolds	Tiahrt
Bilirakis	Dornan	Hoke	Meehan	Richardson	Torkildsen
Bishop	Doyle	Holden	Meek	Rivers	Torres
Bliley	Dreier	Horn	Menendez	Roberts	Torricelli
Blute	Duncan	Hostettler	Metcalf	Roemer	Towns
Boehlert	Dunn	Houghton	Meyers	Rogers	Traficant
Boehner	Durbin	Hoyer	Mfume	Rohrabacher	Tucker
Bonilla	Edwards	Hunter	Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Bonior	Ehlers	Hutchinson	Miller (CA)	Roth	Velazquez
Bono	Ehrlich	Hyde	Miller (FL)	Roukema	Vento
Borski	Emerson	Inglis	Mineta	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Boucher	Engel	Istook	Minge	Royce	Volkmer
Brewster	English	Jackson-Lee	Mink	Rush	Vucanovich
Browder	Ensign	Jacobs	Moakley	Sabo	Waldholtz
Brown (CA)	Eshoo	Jefferson	Molinari	Salmon	Walker
Brown (FL)	Evans	Johnson (CT)	Mollohan	Sanders	Walsh
Brown (OH)	Everett	Johnson (SD)	Montgomery	Sanford	Wamp
Brownback	Ewing	Johnson, E. B.	Moorhead	Sawyer	Ward
Bryant (TN)	Farr	Johnson, Sam	Moran	Saxton	Waters
Bryant (TX)	Fawell	Johnston	Morella	Scarborough	Watt (NC)
Bunn	Fazio	Jones	Murtha	Schaefer	Watts (OK)
Bunning	Fields (LA)	Kanjorski	Myers	Schiff	Waxman
Burr	Fields (TX)	Kaptur	Myrick	Schroeder	Weldon (FL)
Burton	Filner	Kasich	Nadler	Scott	Weldon (PA)
Buyer	Flanagan	Kelly	Neal	Seastrand	Weller
Callahan	Foglietta	Kennedy (MA)	Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	White
Calvert	Foley	Kennedy (RI)	Neumann	Serrano	Whitfield
Camp	Forbes	Kennelly	Ney	Shadegg	Wicker
Canady	Ford	Kildee	Norwood	Shaw	Williams
Cardin	Fowler	Kim	Nussle	Shays	Wilson
Castle	Fox	King	Oberstar	Shuster	Wolf
Chabot	Franks (CT)	Kingston	Obey	Sisisky	Woolsey
Chambliss	Franks (NJ)	Kleczka	Olver	Skaggs	Wyden
Chapman	Frelinghuysen	Klink	Ortiz	Skeen	Wynn
Chenoweth	Frisa	Klug	Orton	Skelton	Yates
Christensen	Frost	Knollenberg	Owens	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Chrysler	Funderburk	Kolbe	Oxley	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Clay	Furse	LaFalce	Packard	Smith (NJ)	Zeliff
Clayton	Galleghy	LaHood	Pallone	Smith (TX)	Zimmer
Clement	Ganske	Largent	Parker	Smith (WA)	
Clinger	Gejdenson	Latham			
Clyburn	Gephardt	LaTourette			
Coble	Geren	Laughlin			
Coburn	Gibbons	Lazio			
Coleman	Gilcrest	Leach			
Collins (GA)	Gillmor	Levin			
Collins (IL)	Gilman	Lewis (CA)			
Collins (MI)	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)			
Combest	Goodlatte	Lightfoot			
Condit	Goodling	Lincoln			
Conyers	Gordon	Linder			
Cooley	Goss	Lipinski			
Costello	Graham	LoBiondo			
Cox	Green	Lofgren			

□ 1325

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). On this rollcall, 419 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time remains on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 2½ minutes remaining, and he has the right to close.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking minority member of the Committee on National Security.